

# WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION FOR CHILDREN & FAMILIES

## EBP Sustainability Meeting December 4th, 2014

### Minutes of Meeting

#### **Welcome and Introductions.**

The meeting began at 1:05 PM

WACF members who attended were: Shannon Bayne, Charlotte Booth, Ifeany Chukwu, Jessie DiParto, Melissa Gorgone, Dave Kucklick, Christi Lyson, Phoebe Mulligan, Tom Rembeisa, Kris Sanborn, Kerry Ann Shaughnessy, and Anna Thompson.

Children's Administration staff who attended were: Tim Kelly, Monica Jenkins, Dianne Kidner, and Andrea Ringer.

#### **Fidelity monitoring for The Incredible Years.**

The CA will continue to pay for certification. If an agency has someone ready for certification, contact Tim, and he will pull in Lisa St George. Contracts call for twice a year consults for certified staff; but the consults are not available at this time. If CA contracts monitors bring this up, contact the regional EBP managers or Tim.

Tim asked for volunteers to work on a new post-certification fidelity monitoring system; this is not addressed in the IY system, and the system we used now can be changed. . For pre-certification, we will continue to use the IY system. Kerry Ann volunteered to pull together some folks to talk with Lisa about this and develop a proposal.

#### **Cost sharing between CA and private agencies for EBP training.**

We all want a fair and equitable way to cover the costs of building and sustaining EBPs. The CA is committed to paying for fidelity monitoring, although questions are being raised nationally about how much monitoring is needed to sustain fidelity. How the required training costs will be covered going forward is open to discussion.

There is a very wide variance in the cost of required training in each of the EBPs, with IY at the low end (\$800), and SafeCare at the high end (\$10,000), although Triple P is not far behind (\$7000). This variance makes it hard to use a single formula for deciding what portion of the training costs should be paid by the CA vs. what is reasonable to expect of private agencies.

The WACF is working with Georgia/SafeCare and the CA to develop local SafeCare training capacity, which would bring down the costs dramatically. Triple P is not willing to let local training capacity be built.

The cost to private agencies to send staff to training needs to be factored in. Members agreed to send Tim their daily costs to send a staff, including payroll and benefits, travel costs, and lost revenue.

## WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION FOR CHILDREN & FAMILIES

Options for cost sharing discussed included splitting some % of the cost of a workshop, the private agency paying for some or all of the training but being reimbursed when the trained staff had been on the job a certain amount of time, and the private agency paying for some or all training but being reimbursed when the staff has delivered a certain amount of the service.

### **What criteria should be used for provider selection to receive EBP training and contracts?**

Members expressed concern about the past lack of transparency in selecting providers. Tim asked what a fair and transparent system would look like.

Suggestions were:

1. A CA notice goes out (perhaps using the new list serve) when there is going to be training offered.
2. Agencies respond if they are interested, and receive acknowledgement of that response.
3. All regions use the same process for selecting who attends the training
4. The criteria used by the regions are made public.
5. The readiness assessment form developed by CA is good, and could be used as part of the selection process (note: agencies only have to do the entire assessment once; after the first time they only do the service-specific part of the assessment).
6. Other criteria could include the applicant's history of performance and model fidelity, agency capacity to do ongoing supervision and management, ability to serve unique populations, languages spoken, and geographic area the agency can cover.
7. It might be useful to have the applicant agency put forth the name of and information about the staff person(s) they proposed to have trained; a person-specific application.

### **What is a reasonable expectation for staff retention if turnover rates are used in provider selection?**

Member agencies acknowledged their responsibility to work harder to ensure a good fit before sending a staff to EBP training.

Members would like the CA to work at ensuring adequate referrals to sustain EBP trained staff.

No consensus was reached about what rates are acceptable, or how long a staff should be expected to continue to deliver the EBP. Turnover rates as a selection criterion might be moot if a system were in place for reimbursement of training costs based on staff retention or amount of the EBP the new person delivers.

# WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION FOR CHILDREN & FAMILIES

## **What can be done to help resolve the referral/utilization problems?**

Association members agreed that the number one reason they have had turnover of EBP-trained staff is inadequate and/or erratic referrals.

All present agreed new providers should not be added if existing providers are not being fully utilized. There needs to be a match between need and budget, CA office by CA office, and the provider capacity built.

Tim said if an agency has a newly retained EBP staff who is not getting the needed referrals within one month, they should contact him and/or CA Regional EBP Manager.

## **Wrap up and next steps**

We agreed the meeting has been useful, and we should meet again to further discuss cost sharing and other EPB sustainability issues. Future meetings can probably be done by conference call rather than in-person.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM.